IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.H.L.DATTU
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.T.SANKARAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD MAY 2007 / 2ND JYAISHTA 1929

WA.No. 1106 of 2007()

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.35519/2003
.....

APPELLANT: PETITIONER

SOCIO ECONOMIC UNIT FOUNDATION,
EASWARA VILASOM ROAD, VAZHUTHACAUD P.O.,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REPRESENTED BY ITS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, JAMES VARGHESE.

BY ADV. SRI.PIRAPPANCODE V.SREEDHARAN NAIR
SRI.PIRAPPANCODE V.S.SUDHIR

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS
---

1. SMT.M.K.SUMALATHA, MANKOTTIL HOUSE,
KOODATHIL PARAMB, CHERUVANNUR P.O.,
FAROKE, KOZHIKODE.

2. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, PALAKKAD.

R2 BY SR.GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.MEERA

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 23/05/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

H.L.DATTU, C.J. & K.T.SANKARAN, J.

W.A.No. 1106 of 2007

Dated, this the 23rd day of May, 2007

JUDGMENT

H.L.Dattu, C.J.

The management, aggrieved by the orders passed by the Industrial Tribunal in I.D.No.1 of 2002, was before this Court in W.P.(C) No.35519 of 2003. By the impugned award the Industrial Tribunal had directed the management to reinstate the first respondent into service without backwages and also to grant certain monetary benefits.

2. The learned Single Judge after noticing each one of the contentions canvassed by the petitioner and its learned counsel has come to the conclusion that the award passed by the learned Tribunal does not call for any interference by him.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the appellant reiterates the contentions canvassed before the learned Single Judge and also submits that by an earlier order the dispute between the parties has come to an end and without noticing that order the learned Single Judge could not have confirmed the award passed by the Industrial Tribunal.

4. First and foremost, in our view, the learned Single

Judge has dealt with the matter in detail and has given appropriate findings on each one of the issues canvassed by the learned counsel appearing for the appellant. In our view, reiteration of the very arguments canvassed and negatived by the learned Single Judge may not be necessary for the purpose of disposal of this writ appeal. Further, the reliance made by the learned counsel for the appellant on a decision rendered in O.P.No.10352 of 1996 which was disposed of on 20th August, 1996 has no relevance whatsoever in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

5. Having gone through the orders passed by the learned Single Judge, we are of the firm opinion that the learned Single Judge has not committed any error which requires interference in this appeal. Accordingly the writ appeal requires to be rejected and it is rejected. Ordered accordingly.

H.L.DATTU, CHIEF JUSTICE

K.T.SANKARAN, JUDGE

vns